DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 035 HE 003 478

AUTHOR	Carbone, Robert F.
TITLE	Voting Rights and the Nonresident Student.
SPONS AGENCY	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; *Financial Problems; *Higher Education; Nonresident Students; *Residence Requirements; Resident Students; *Student Costs; *Tuition; Voter Registration; Voting Rights

ABSTRACT

The recent decision in most states concerning the voting rights of out-of-state students may have severe financial implications for public higher education institutions. Students are claiming that if they are registered to vote in their college's state, they are legal residents of the state and thus should not be charged out-of-state tuition at state colleges. If this point of view is upheld by the courts, it is estimated that institutional income would drop somewhere between $250 to $300 million a year. It is projected that this would result in the raising of all tuitions to make up the difference, which would in turn result in the abolition of the low tuition principle upon which public higher education in America has been built. (HS)

ED 068035

VOTING RIGHTS AND THE NONRESIDENT STUDENT

By

Robert F. Carbone
Dean, College of Education
University of Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 710
Washington, D. C. 20036

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D. C. 20036

HE 003 478

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

VOTING RIGHTS AND THE NONRESIDENT STUDENT

If adult status and voting rights for college-age citizens eliminate nonresident tuition charges in public colleges and universities, the effect on higher education budgets will be staggering. The drop in institutional income would be in the range of $250 to $300 million a year.

This estimate is based on a survey of nearly 400 public four-year colleges and universities, all members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). The survey also yielded information on the accessibility of the ballot box to students, student predisposition to become registered voters and efforts by nonresident students to use their newfound status as voters to avoid paying higher "out-of-state" fees.

Responses covering 118 NASULGC institutions and 244 AASCU institutions provided a comprehensive view of the situation in all states. This represents all students enrolled in the state universities and land-grant colleges and 85 percent of those attending AASCU institutions. In an effort to include the 15 percent nonrespondents among AASCU institutions, a general projection was made of both enrollments and tuition income for all the institutions in that association. Estimates were also used for some NASULGC institutions when responses were incomplete.

Enrollments and Tuition

A total of 463,357 nonresident students were enrolled in all public four-year colleges and universities during the fall term of 1971.

NASULGC institutions enrolled 297,757 of these nonresidents. There were 140,760 nonresident students enrolled at the 244 AASCU institutions participating in the survey, and when this was extrapolated to include all AASCU institutions, the total enrollment in those colleges and universities was estimated to be 165,600 nonresident students.

In order to convert the above figures into an estimate of "potential" tuition income from nonresident students, it was necessary to make a basic assumption that should be clearly understood. It was assumed that all the 463,357 students actually paid full nonresident tuition at the prevailing rates for full-time nonresident students at each institution.

As many respondents correctly pointed out, this assumption does not hold true at many (if any) of the public colleges and universities in this country. Therefore, calculations based on this assumption clearly give an inflated estimate of the income institutions receive from nonresident fees. There are several reasons for this. Nonresident students who are not considered "full-time students" according to the institution's definition of "full-time student" or "normal load" probably do not pay as much if any differential. Often, nonresident students who take up to six credit hours pay the resident student rate. Many students also attend college under scholarships, grants or special fee remission schemes that excuse them from the higher rates. Finally, employees and students who serve as graduate teaching and research assistants are excused from nonresident fees as a condition of employment.

The complexities involved in trying to adjust this survey to reflect the multitude of variations would have resulted in a monu-

mental task. Requesting actual income figures from printed budgets would have been another approach, but this was rejected because timing of the survey would have precluded use of accurate spring term income figures. Therefore, it was decided that a total "potential" income figure would be derived by multiplying total nonresident enrollments by the differential between resident and nonresident tuition. However, based on reports from the participating colleges and universities, it was determined that actual income for most institutions from nonresident fees would be somewhere in the range of 75-90 percent of the total "potential" income figure.

Therefore to estimate actual income loss if the nonresident tuition differential were eliminated, it was necessary to take the amount of total "potential" income and then calculate what 75 and 90 percent of this figure would be.

The total "potential" nonresident tuition income to all public four-year colleges and universities during the 1971-72 academic year was estimated to be $329,090,406. The amount of total "potential" income for NASULGC institutions was $237,981,732. The possible income for the 244 reporting AASCU institutions was $77,442,373. This was extrapolated to reflect income for all AASCU members, with $91,108,674 the estimated total. The grand total was then determined by adding the actual NASULGC figure and the estimated AASCU figure.

Percentages of the estimated total were then calculated as follows:

Total potential income	=	$329,090,406
75% of total	=	$246,817,804
90% of total	=	$296,181,365

With these figures in hand, it was then possible to estimate that the total actual income from nonresident tuition in public college and university budgets was between $250 and $300 million in 1971-72.

The tables at the back of the report categorize these figures in three ways. Table I reports the tally of actual responses by states. Table II reports the responses from NASULGC institutions individually by states. Table III reports the responses from AASCU institutions grouped by states. It should be noted that the figures on these tables do not reflect actual tuition income collected by institutions and that the totals reflect only those institutions that actually responded (viz., all NASULGC institutions and 85 percent of the AASCU institutions).

Voting Rights for Students

Institutions were asked if court decisions or other legal actions in the local community or state influenced the right of students to become registered voters in state or local elections. The replies clearly indicated that registration lists are highly accessible to students at this time.

The widely publicized Tennessee case (Dunn v. Blumstein) was an important factor in removing obstacles to student registration. In that case, the United States Supreme Court struck down long durational requirements for voting in state and Congressional elections. This action was cited in a spate of opinions by state attorneys general, decisions by state election boards and state court rulings which directed voting registrars to ignore long

qualifying periods and permitted only a 30-day pre-election period for verifying the authenticity of voter lists.

State courts, acting prior to or independent of the Tennessee opinion, have generally ruled in favor of students who sought voting rights in the communities where they attended college. Such cases were reported by institutions in California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Vermont and Wisconsin.

Two cases illustrate the general view expressed by the courts. In a California case (Jolicoeur v. Milhaly), the State Supreme Court ruled that a recent state law granting voting rights to all citizens age 18 or older requires voter registrars to treat all citizens alike for all purposes related to voting. Thus, the domicile of a prospective voter cannot be questioned solely on the basis of age. The Kentucky case (Bright v. Baesler) permanently enjoined registrars from imposing upon students domiciliary requirements that are more rigorous than those imposed upon other citizens.

In virtually every state, institutions reported that local voter registrars are certifying students as voters if they meet other qualifications and, in some states, if they also declare intent to remain in that state. This is somewhat in contrast to a recent survey conducted by Common Cause which reported that between 33 and 40 states had opened voter rolls to students. College officials in states alleged to prohibit students from registering in communities where they attend college (with the exception of New York) reported that students are being registered as voters. These states were Indiana, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

In other states where the presumption of nonresidence supposedly cannot be overcome if the student lives in a dormitory or pays out-of-state tuition, some colleges reported that students are being registered (e.g., Minnesota and Virginia) or that legal actions are pending that give promise of permitting them to register (e.g., Delaware, New Jersey and Ohio).

Based on these reports, it appears likely that few nonresident students anywhere in the country will be denied voting rights in their college communities this fall. The Council of State Governments, in a recent monograph titled "The Age of Majority," agrees. The report concludes that the predominant number of opinions and the cases thus far decided in the high U.S. or state courts indicate that younger voters have the right to determine their residence in the same manner as voters aged 21 or more. However, it is uncertain whether this will have an immediate effect on their status as nonresidents for tuition purposes in the colleges and universities they attend.

Have the Students Registered?

The right of students to register as voters can be firmly documented. Whether or not students will take advantage of this opportunity is a more difficult question to answer. College and university administrators contacted in this survey were asked to estimate the extent of student registration in the community in which the institution was located.

The responses seem to corroborate earlier reports that students were not flooding voter registrars with applications. Only 23 insti-

tutions said that 70 percent or more of their students were registered. The highest estimate reported was 78.8 percent at Bowling Green State University (Ohio), based on a "random sample poll" conducted by the student newspaper.

In 135 other institutions, administrators estimated that from 30 to 70 percent of the students were registered. However, in the largest cluster of institutions -- 182 colleges and universities -- it was thought that fewer than 30 percent of the students had officially been listed as voters.

It should be recalled that these are, at best, rough estimates. No hard figures on student registration were readily available to the survey respondents. Furthermore, the survey was made in spring 1972, so these estimates do not reflect voter registration activities conducted during the summer.

It is likely that the forthcoming national elections will stimulate considerable voter registration efforts throughout the country. Certainly, much of this activity will center on college and university campuses during the fall term. At the time of the survey, however, student interest in voting in college communities could only be described as moderate.

Classification for Tuition Purposes

It is conceivable that at least some of the college students who have registered to vote are classified as "nonresidents for tuition purposes." If so, they might seek to qualify for "in-state" tuition by virtue of the fact that they are now registered voters of the state or community.

Campus officers were asked if students had sought to be declared residents for tuition purposes under these circumstances. The responses were almost evenly divided: 175 replies indicated that one or more students had requested reclassification because they now were registered voters, while 174 institutions reported that no such requests had been filed. However, a number of institutions in this latter category indicated that they expected requests for reclassification when the students returned in the fall.

Several of the institutions that responded affirmatively to this question said that the requests were limited to "office inquiries" or that requests for reclassification were not based solely on status as a voter. Apparently, students in those cases merely added this element to the other arguments they were presenting (e.g., payment of taxes, registration of automobile, driver's license, etc.).

Most institutions have denied requests from students that they be declared residents for tuition purposes because they are registered voters in the state. Louisiana State University's response illustrates the general reason for denial. The university noted that criteria for establishing residency are not based on being a registered voter in the state. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that state codes permit each state agency to set its own residence requirements, as the response from Kent State University pointed out.

However, the problem is more critical in Alabama where one of the conditions for earning resident status at public colleges and universities is that the student be a registered voter in the state. One Alabama institution commented that the question had not yet been resolved by the university and election officials. The report

concludes, "...it is obvious that we will have to face it in the very near future and we hope that the courts will rule that criteria other than voter registration can be used for out-of-state tuition classification."

However, the University of Georgia noted in its survey response "...that there has traditionally been a close relationship between voter registration and classification of students for tuition purposes." Clearly, many campus officials are apprehensive about this situation, realizing that substantial loss of income from nonresident tuition might result. An official at one university even suggested that the less said about the issue the better, seemingly expressing the hope that students would not press the point. However, litigation already pending indicates that this is not the case.

Legislative Actions

A number of legislative actions during the past year affected nonresident students, their voting rights and the relation of voting rights to regulations governing the classification of students for tuition purposes at public colleges.

In California, a new state law mandated March 4, 1972 as the date when Californians aged 18 years or older were to be considered as adults for virtually all purposes, including voting. This has been interpreted to mean that, as of that date, 18-year-old students could commence the durational residence requirement (one year) in order to establish legal residence for tuition purposes at state colleges and universities. Thus, completion of the one-year requirement, plus evidence of intent to remain in the state, will enable

students to achieve reclassification as residents for tuition purposes.

The New Mexico legislature enacted a bill which classifies as nonresidents those who are not graduates of New Mexico high schools and who are registered for six or more credits at a public institution. In addition, the bill created an irrebuttable presumption of non-residence which prevented a student so classified from being designated a resident while in continuous attendance. The law has already been struck down by a federal panel, and it would appear that similar legislation passed by the Washington legislature would suffer the same fate. An out-of-state students' organization at the University of Washington is considering a legal challenge to that state's law. Reportedly, some members of the group have contributed funds to hire legal aid in preparing the suit.

A recent Georgia law also seems to create a situation that could generate litigation. It reaffirms that residency for voting purposes is unrelated to residence for tuition purposes in higher education. None of the Georgia institutions reported legal activity based on this law at present, but the situation would seem to lend itself to a clear test of the issue.

Legislative actions in other states, as reported by the institutions contacted in this survey, were generally concerned with either raising nonresident student fees or with setting quotas limiting admission of nonresident students. Similar developments occurred in some states as the result of actions by boards of regents or statewide higher education coordinating agencies.

Legal Actions

Recent legal actions involving nonresident students account for a rather confusing picture of the situatior at present which, hopefully, may clear as cases now pending are resolved. A U.S. Supreme Court decision upheld the one-year durational requirement for earning residency for tuition purposes in Minnesota. Subsequently, the State Supreme Court in Arizona issued a ruling that upheld the system of assessing differential tuition for nonresident students in that state and a Mississippi state court ruled against a student who claimed that the presumption of nonresidence there was irrebuttable.

More directly related to the voting issue, a state court in Alabama reportedly handed down a decision that appears to say that if a student is a state resident for one purpose, he or she should also be considered a resident for all other purposes. The effect of this decision was not made clear by the institutions that mentioned it.

Cases that are entirely or in part based on student status as voters are pending or under appeal in a number of other states. Most recent is a suit brought by two University of Connecticut students. The court ruled in favor of the students and ordered the university to refund the fees in question. An appeal has been filed by the state attorney general in this case.

In another action, when six University of Michigan students sought to enjoin the university from charging nonresident fees to students registered as voters, a circuit court judge refused to issue a temporary injunction. The judge, however, retained authority

to issue a permanent injunction against the collection of nonresident tuition if the students subsequently prove their claim in a trial.

A young married couple attending South Dakota State University was awarded resident status in a state court judgment based partially on the fact that they had voted and were taxpayers of the state. Currently pending are two cases involving students at the University of Maryland and at Central Missouri State College in which student status as registered voters in the respective states is a primary factor. Legal actions brought by students at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Pittsburgh and North Carolina State University are also pending. However, in these cases, other issues (viz., marriage to a resident or a nonresident and proper hearing procedures) rather than voting status are the issues at stake.

Conclusion

It has been estimated that the 26th Amendment to the U. S. Constitution extended voting rights in federal elections to about 4 million college students in this country. A majority of these students will also qualify as voters in state and local elections.

What this will mean in terms of the ability of institutions to continue collecting nonresident tuition is far from clear. Most probably, there will be time for serious discussion of the matter before anything drastic occurs. Yet, the future of nonresident tuition is far from assured. Already, there have been predictions of its eventual demise. If that happens, public colleges and universities will be hard hit.

Few realistic alternatives to nonresident tuition have been advanced. Recently, Bowling Green State University implemented a plan which sets fees for nonresidents at a level comparable to the per-student state allocation for resident students. Other creative efforts in this matter have not been reported if, indeed, they exist.

One obvious solution -- federal support based on the number of nonresident students enrolled -- has never received serious consideration by either higher education officials or the federal government.

If nonresident tuition is declared illegal, it is likely that the institutional response will be to increase the fees of all students to cover lost income. Clearly, this expediency would strike a telling blow to the "low tuition principle" upon which public higher education in America has been built. The cost to society would be far more than the additional dollars that students and their parents would be forced to pay. It would seem wise for the leaders of public higher education to give thought to other, more creative, responses while there is still time for contemplation.

# # # # # # # #

TABLE I

TOTAL NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT AND POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION*
IN PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES -- FALL 1971

*Based on the assumption that all nonresident students pay a differential tuition. Figures for potential nonresident tuition were obtained by multiplying nonresident enrollment by tuition differential.

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
ALABAMA	6,434	$ 2,746,065
ALASKA	241	61,570
ARIZONA	14,461	10,694,878
ARKANSAS	4,161	1,798,630
CALIFORNIA	12,213	15,778,003
COLORADO	19,730	21,590,088
CONNECTICUT	3,933	3,539,700
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	339	125,303
DELAWARE	4,233	3,564,240
FLORIDA	6,695	7,029,750
GEORGIA	14,060	6,427,486
GUAM	1,265	202,400
HAWAII	1,521	775,710
IDAHO	2,842	1,976,860
ILLINOIS	12,368	10,339,631
INDIANA	17,797	13,937,466
IOWA	9,072	5,150,600
KANSAS	10,322	5,720,326
KENTUCKY	9,938	5,314,080
LOUISIANA	5,502	2,480,590
MAINE	2,724	4,567,791

1. Note: Not actual institutional income. Totals based on 360 institutional responses; does not include 43 state colleges that did not return the questionnaire.

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
MARYLAND	9,814	$ 3,587,470
MASSACHUSETTS	4,908	1,112,376
MICHIGAN	19,543	18,896,817
MINNESOTA	26,370	6,716,832
MISSISSIPPI	9,727	2,776,700
MISSOURI	11,528	8,175,110
MONTANA	3,769	3,053,554
NEBRASKA	2,327	1,764,716
NEVADA	2,000	3,000,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	4,388	3,917,600
NEW JERSEY	5,626	833,940
NEW MEXICO	4,207	3,454,780
NEW YORK	16,877	5,019,577
NORTH CAROLINA	10,892	11,177,294
NORTH DAKOTA	3,083	1,813,720
OHIO	15,928	14,379,535
OKLAHOMA	6,585	4,398,190
OREGON	5,490	5,428,716
PENNSYLVANIA	15,418	12,945,994
RHODE ISLAND	3,451	2,084,490
SOUTH CAROLINA	4,969	1,963,830
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,621	1,112,271
TENNESSEE	10,675	5,921,780
TEXAS	21,728	19,358,540
UTAH	6,086	3,654,060
VERMONT	3,366	4,372,230

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
VIRGINIA	11,266	$ 4,580,945
VIRGIN ISLANDS	156	62,400
WASHINGTON	6,173	6,183,318
WEST VIRGINIA	8,775	6,565,810
WISCONSIN	17,360	22,293,572
WYOMING	2,560	2,472,960
TOTAL	438,517	$316,893,295

TABLE II

NONRESIDENT STUDENTS AND POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION*
IN NASULGC INSTITUTIONS -- FALL 1971

*Based on the assumption that all nonresident students pay a differential tuition. Figures for potential nonresident tuition were obtained by multiplying nonresident enrollment by tuition differential.

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
ALABAMA		
Alabama A & M University	62	$ 9,300
Auburn University	3,237	1,352,700
University of Alabama	2,384	1,193,913
ALASKA		
University of Alaska	241	61,570
ARIZONA		
Arizona State University	5,582	3,181,740
University of Arizona	7,157	6,369,730
ARKANSAS		
University of Arkansas	2,931	1,469,190
CALIFORNIA		
University of California (all campuses)	8,378	12,567,000
COLORADO		
Colorado State University	5,881	7,233,630
University of Colorado	7,830	9,928,440
CONNECTICUT		
University of Connecticut	2,759	2,483,100

1. Note: Not actual institutional income.

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
DELAWARE		
Delaware State College	471	$ 113,040
University of Delaware	3,762	3,451,200
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Federal City College	300	87,200
FLORIDA		
Florida A & M University	358	375,900
Florida State University	2,319	2,434,950
University of Florida	2,097	2,201,850
GEORGIA		
Fort Valley State College	89	27,056
Georgia Institute of Technology	3,763	2,276,615
University of Georgia	4,018	2,169,720
HAWAII		
University of Hawaii	1,521	775,710
IDAHO		
University of Idaho	1,913	1,530,400
ILLINOIS		
Southern Illinois University	1,812	1,554,696
University of Illinois	4,701	4,033,458
INDIANA		
Indiana University (Estimate)	8,623	6,625,920
Purdue University	6,686	6,017,400
IOWA		
Iowa State University	3,871	2,310,420
University of Iowa	4,914	2,725,380

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
KANSAS		
Kansas State University	2,651	1,564,090
University of Kansas	5,551	3,275,090
KENTUCKY		
Kentucky State College	424	212,000
University of Kentucky	3,719	2,573,300
LOUISIANA		
Louisiana State University	3,536	1,704,800
Southern University	518	156,290
MAINE		
University of Maine, Orono (Estimate)	500	500,000
MARYLAND		
University of Maryland	6,903	2,886,780
MASSACHUSETTS		
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	No differential tuition involved	
University of Massachusetts	4,039	838,600
MICHIGAN		
Michigan State University	6,435	2,873,685
University of Michigan	8,248	11,730,864
Wayne State University	1,139	1,437,915
MINNESOTA		
University of Minnesota	6,858	5,655,744
MISSISSIPPI		
Alcorn A & M College	68	40,800
Mississippi State University	993	595,800
University of Mississippi	2,224	1,334,400

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
MISSOURI		
Lincoln University	572	77,220
University of Missouri	7,407	6,814,440
MONTANA		
Montana State University	1,347	1,025,629
University of Montana	2,117	1,793,099
NEBRASKA		
University of Nebraska (Estimate)	1,500	1,500,000
NEVADA		
University of Nevada at Reno (Estimate)	1,000	1,500,00
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
University of New Hampshire	3,044	3,044,000
NEW JERSEY		
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	3,719	655,600
NEW MEXICO		
New Mexico State University	1,023	849,090
University of New Mexico	3,049	2,529,145
NEW YORK		
City University of New York	1,857	712,800
Cornell University	6,267	1,858,400
State University of New York (Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook)	3,749	975,700

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
NORTH CAROLINA		
North Carolina A & T State University (Estimate)	200	120,000
North Carolina State University	2,499	2,107,773
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	3,853	4,141,975
NORTH DAKOTA		
North Dakota State University	1,084	660,156
University of North Dakota	1,590	966,720
OHIO		
Kent State University	2,438	2,438,000
Miami University	2,205	2,315,250
Ohio State University	6,095	6,399,750
OKLAHOMA		
Langston University	201	106,128
Oklahoma State University	2,461	1,919,586
University of Oklahoma	3,574	2,230,176
OREGON		
Oregon State University	2,093	2,166,255
University of Oregon	2,499	2,586,465
PENNSYLVANIA		
Pennsylvania State University	3,372	3,439,440
Temple University	4,129	3,716,100
University of Pittsburgh	2,304	2,280,960
PUERTO RICO		
University of Puerto Rico	No differential tuition involved	

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
RHODE ISLAND		
University of Rhode Island	2,701	1,731,240
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Clemson University	1,574	1,057,700
South Carolina State College	141	32,430
University of South Carolina	3,118	779,500
SOUTH DAKOTA		
South Dakota State University	798	450,432
University of South Dakota	2,461	524,227
TENNESSEE		
Tennessee State University	953	190,600
University of Tennessee	4,501	2,768,115
TEXAS		
Prairie View A & M College (Estimate)	300	180,000
Texas A & M University	2,027	1,702,680
Texas Southern University	669	361,260
Texas Tech University (Estimate)	1,261	1,500,682
University of Houston	2,634	2,265,240
University of Texas System	7,731	6,107,832
UTAH		
University of Utah	3,470	2,342,250
Utah State University	1,896	966,960
VERMONT		
University of Vermont	2,490	3,610,500

STATE	NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION 1
VIRGINIA		
University of Virginia	4,323	2,682,240
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	2,947	326,700
Virginia State College	570	148,200
WASHINGTON		
University of Washington	2,665	2,894,190
Washington State University	1,920	1,952,640
WEST VIRGINIA		
West Virginia University	4,597	3,815,510
WISCONSIN		
University of Wisconsin (Madison, Milwaukee, Green Bay, Parkside, and Center System)	10,736	15,715,590
WYOMING		
University of Wyoming	2,560	2,472,960
TOTALS	297,757	$239,450,922

TABLE III

TOTAL NONRESIDENT STUDENTS AND POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION*
IN AASCU INSTITUTIONS -- FALL 1971

*Based on the assumption that all nonresident students pay a differential tuition. Figures for potential nonresident tuition were obtained by multiplying nonresident enrollment by tuition differential.

STATE	TOTAL AASCU INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL RESPONSES	NONRESIDENT STUDENTS ENROLLED-ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION[1]
ALABAMA	7	5	751	$ 190,152
ARIZONA	1	1	1,722	1,143,408
ARKANSAS	6	5	1,230	329,440
CALIFORNIA	17	15	3,835	3,211,003
COLORADO	6	6	6,019	4,428,018
CONNECTICUT	4	3	1,174	1,056,600
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1	1	39	38,103
FLORIDA	7	4	1,921	2,017,050
GEORGIA	10	9	6,190	1,954,095
GUAM	1	1	1,265	202,400
IDAHO	3	2	929	446,460
ILLINOIS	9	8	5,855	4,751,477
INDIANA	2	2	2,488	1,294,146
IOWA	1	1	287	114,800
KANSAS	4	3	2,120	881,146
KENTUCKY	4	4	5,795	2,528,780
LOUISIANA	7	5	1,448	619,500
MAINE	7	7	2,224	4,067,791
MARYLAND	8	5	2,911	700,690

1. Note: Not actual institutional income.

STATE	TOTAL AASCU INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL RESPONSES	NONRESIDENT STUDENTS ENROLLED-ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
MASSACHUSETTS	12	9	869	$ 273,776
MICHIGAN	10	8	3,721	2,854,353
MINNESOTA	7	7	19,512	1,061,088
MISSISSIPPI	6	5	6,442	805,700
MISSOURI	7	4	3,549	1,283,450
MONTANA	3	3	305	234,826
NEBRASKA	4	3	827	254,716
NEVADA (Estimate)	1	1	1,000	1,500,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	2	1,344	873,600
NEW JERSEY	10	8	1,907	178,340
NEW MEXICO	2	1	135	76,545
NEW YORK	14	14 (ALL SUNY campuses except the 4 Univ. Centers)	5,004	1,472,677
NORTH CAROLINA	8	6	4,340	4,807,546
NORTH DAKOTA	4	4	409	186,844
OHIO	7	6	5,190	3,226,535
OKLAHOMA	6	4	349	142,300
OREGON	4	3	898	675,996
PENNSYLVANIA	14	14	5,613	3,509,494
RHODE ISLAND	1	1	750	353,250
SOUTH CAROLINA	3	2	136	94,200
SOUTH DAKOTA	4	3	362	137,612
TENNESSEE	7	7	5,221	2,963,065
TEXAS	11	9	7,106	7,240,846
UTAH	2	2	720	344,850

TABLE III

STATE	TOTAL AASCU INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL RESPONSES	NONRESIDENT STUDENTS ENROLLED-ALL LEVELS	TOTAL POTENTIAL NONRESIDENT TUITION [1]
VERMONT	3	3	876	761,730
VIRGINIA	8	6	3,426	1,426,805
VIRGIN ISLANDS	1	1	156	62,400
WASHINGTON	4	4	1,588	1,336,488
WEST VIRGINIA	8	8	4,178	2,750,300
WISCONSIN	9	9	6,624	6,577,982
TOTALS	287	244 (85% response)	140,760	$77,442,373